UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,619	02/02/2001	Makoto Hara	2091-0232P	6945

2292 7590 06/06/2007

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER	
SINGH, SATWANT K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/06/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/773,619	HARA, MAKOTO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Satwant K. Singh	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 March 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *5,7,12,14 and 22-35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *5,7,12,14 and 22-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 February 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 01 March 2007.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5, 7, 12, and 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 5, 7, 12, 14, 22-25 and 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stewart et al. (US 6,714,964).

5. Regarding Claim 5, Stewart et al disclose a printing system comprising: at least one customer service system (client side of the network 300a) for receiving, via a network (network 300), order information representing the content of an order of a customer for a print (local applications can be used to create or download a document) (col. 6, lines 18-27) ***(the examiner interprets a document being transmitted to the print side for shipping and delivery as representing a print order)***; a plurality of laboratory servers (Fig. 2C) (print side 300c) (redundant queues (queue 1 and queue 2)

manage the print jobs to be printed) for outputting the print based on the order information transferred via the network from the customer service system that has received the order information (after a document has been sent to the UPJA, it can be sent to the printer side) (col. 7, lines 19-31); and an order assigning system (back end side 300b) existing between the at-least-one customer service system and the laboratory servers, for receiving the order information from the customer service system, for selecting one of the laboratory servers to output the print based on predetermined information (relevant file information sent from the spooler 344 via the port monitor and upload manager to a web server) (col. 5, lines 42-47), and for transferring the order information to the selected laboratory server (UPJA receives the document as it is transmitted across the network) (col. 6, lines 63-67, col. 7, lines 1-7); wherein the predetermined information is information specifying one of the laboratory servers described in the order information by the customer (relevant file information sent from the spooler 344 via the port monitor and upload manager to a web server) (col. 5, lines 42-47).

6. Regarding Claim 7, Stewart et al disclose a printing system comprising: at least one customer service system (client side of the network 300a) for receiving, via a network (network 300), order information representing the content of an order of a customer for a print (local applications can be used to create or download a document) (col. 6, lines 18-27) ***(the examiner interprets a document being transmitted to the print side for shipping and delivery as representing a print order)***; a plurality of laboratory servers (Fig. 2C) (print side 300c) (redundant queues (queue 1 and queue 2)

manage the print jobs to be printed) for outputting the print based on the order information transferred via the network from the customer service system that has received the order information (after a document has been sent to the UPJA, it can be sent to the printer side) (col. 7, lines 19-31); and an order assigning system (back end side 300b) existing between the at-least-one customer service system and the laboratory servers, for receiving the order information from the customer service system, for selecting one of the laboratory servers to output the print based on predetermined information (relevant file information sent from the spooler 344 via the port monitor and upload manager to a web server) (col. 5, lines 42-47), and for transferring the order information to the selected laboratory server (UPJA receives the document as it is transmitted across the network) (col. 6, lines 63-67, col. 7, lines 1-7); the order assigning system transferring information related to the selected laboratory to the customer service system that received the order information (local applications can be used to create or download a document that the user can ultimately forward to the print side) (col. 6, lines 18-50), the customer service system generating selection information (relevant file information) for determining a desired one of the laboratory servers based on the information and transferring the selection information to the order assigning system, and the order assigning system using the selection information as the predetermined information (relevant file information sent from the spooler 344 via the port monitor and upload manager to a web server) (col. 5, lines 42-47).

7. Regarding Claim 12, Stewart et al disclose a printing system comprising: a plurality of laboratory servers (Fig. 2C) (print side 300c) (redundant queues (queue 1

and queue 2) manage the print jobs to be printed) for outputting a print (after a document has been sent to the UPJA, it can be sent to the printer side) (col. 7, lines 19-31); and at least one order receiving assigning system comprising a customer service system (client side of the network 300a) for receiving order information including customer information from a customer via the network (local applications can be used to create or download a document) (col. 6, lines 18-27) ***(the examiner interprets a document being transmitted to the print side for shipping and delivery as representing a print order)***, and an assigning system (back end side 300b) for selecting, based on predetermined information (relevant file information), one of the laboratory servers to receive the order information, and for transferring the order information to the selected laboratory server (after a document has been sent to the UPJA, it can be sent to the printer side) (col. 7, lines 19-31); wherein the predetermined information is information identifying one of the laboratory servers specified by the customer in the order information (relevant file information sent from the spooler 344 via the port monitor and upload manager to a web server) (col. 5, lines 42-47).

8. Regarding Claim 14, Stewart et al disclose a printing system comprising: a plurality of laboratory servers for outputting a print (Fig. 2C) (print side 300c) (redundant queues (queue 1 and queue 2) manage the print jobs to be printed); and at least one order receiving assigning system comprising a customer service system for receiving order information including customer information from a customer via the network (local applications can be used to create or download a document) (col. 6, lines 18-27) ***(the examiner interprets a document being transmitted to the print side for shipping***

and delivery as representing a print order), and an assigning system for selecting (back end side 300b), based on predetermined information (relevant file information), one of the laboratory servers to receive the order information, and for transferring the order information to the selected laboratory server(after a document has been sent to the UPJA, it can be sent to the printer side) (col. 7, lines 19-31); wherein the order receiving assigning system or systems generate selection information by determining a desired one of the laboratory servers based on information related to the selected laboratory server, and use the selection information as the predetermined information (relevant file information sent from the spooler 344 via the port monitor and upload manager to a web server) (col. 5, lines 42-47).

9. Regarding Claim 22, Stewart et al disclose a printing system, wherein a desired one of the laboratory servers is determined based on information related to the selected laboratory server and customer-specific information (relevant file information includes printer name, job id, printing level and document information) (col. 5, lines 42-47).

10. Regarding Claim 23, Stewart et al disclose a printing system, wherein the information related to the selected laboratory is based on the selected laboratory's location and said customer-specific information is a customer's address or a customer's area code (documents are replicated on printers for ultimate shipping and delivery of the completed product to an address or location specified by the user) (col. 7, lines 19-41).

11. Regarding Claim 24, Stewart et al disclose a printing system, wherein a desired one of the laboratory servers is determined based on information related to the selected laboratory server and the content of the order information (relevant file information

includes printer name, job id, printing level and document information) (col. 5, lines 42-47).

12. Regarding Claim 25, Stewart et al disclose a printing system, wherein the content of the order information specifies a particular print service to be carried out (relevant file information) (col. 5, lines 42-47), and wherein a desired one of the laboratory servers is determined based on the capability of the selected laboratory for performing the particular print service (print driver builds and creates objects necessary to communicate with the selected printing device) (col. 6, lines 22-31).

13. Regarding Claim 29, Stewart et al disclose a printing system, wherein a desired one of the laboratory servers is determined based on information related to the selected laboratory server and customer-specific information (relevant file information includes printer name, job id, printing level and document information) (col. 5, lines 42-47).

14. Regarding Claim 30, Stewart et al disclose a printing system, wherein the information related to the selected laboratory is based on the selected laboratory's location and said customer-specific information is a customer's address or a customer's area code (documents are replicated on printers for ultimate shipping and delivery of the completed product to an address or location specified by the user) (col. 7, lines 19-41).

15. Regarding Claim 31, Stewart et al disclose a printing system, wherein a desired one of the laboratory servers is determined based on information related to the selected laboratory server and the content of the order information (relevant file information includes printer name, job id, printing level and document information) (col. 5, lines 42-47).

16. Regarding Claim 32, Stewart et al disclose a printing system, wherein the content of the order information specifies a particular print service to be carried out (relevant file information) (col. 5, lines 42-47), and wherein a desired one of the laboratory servers is determined based on the capability of the selected laboratory for performing the particular print service (print driver builds and creates objects necessary to communicate with the selected printing device) (col. 6, lines 22-31).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 26-28, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al. in view of Aoki (US 6,631,008).

19. Regarding Claim 26, Stewart et al fail to teach a printing system, wherein a desired one of the laboratory servers is determined based upon a determined load status of the selected laboratory server.

Aoki teaches a printing system, wherein a desired one of the laboratory servers is determined based upon a determined load status of the selected laboratory server (how much load a printer has) (col. 12, lines 18-37).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Stewart with the teaching of Aoki to transmit a print job to a printer depending on its workload.

20. Regarding Claim 27, Stewart et al fail to teach a printing system, wherein the load status of the selected laboratory server is determined by querying, at the time of selection, the laboratory server for load status information.

Aoki teaches a printing system, wherein the load status of the selected laboratory server is determined by querying, at the time of selection, the laboratory server for load status information (inquiry message) (col. 12, lines 18-37).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Stewart with the teaching of Aoki to transmit a print job to a printer depending on its workload.

21. Regarding Claim 28, Stewart et al fail to teach a printing system, wherein the load status of the selected laboratory server is determined by querying, at the time of selection, a database containing load status information for the selected laboratory server.

Aoki teaches a printing system, wherein the load status of the selected laboratory server is determined by querying, at the time of selection, a database containing load status information for the selected laboratory server (inquiry message) (col. 12, lines 18-37).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Stewart with the teaching of Aoki to transmit a print job to a printer depending on its workload.

22. Regarding Claim 33, Stewart et al fail to teach a printing system, wherein a desired one of the laboratory servers is determined based upon a determined load status of the selected laboratory server.

Aoki teaches a printing system, wherein a desired one of the laboratory servers is determined based upon a determined load status of the selected laboratory server (how much load a printer has) (col. 12, lines 18-37).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Stewart with the teaching of Aoki to transmit a print job to a printer depending on its workload.

23. Regarding Claim 34, Stewart et al fail to teach a printing system, wherein the load status of the selected laboratory server is determined by querying, at the time of selection, the laboratory server for load status information.

Aoki teaches a printing system, wherein the load status of the selected laboratory server is determined by querying, at the time of selection, the laboratory server for load status information (inquiry message) (col. 12, lines 18-37).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Stewart with the teaching of Aoki to transmit a print job to a printer depending on its workload.

24. Regarding Claim 35, Stewart et al fail to teach a printing system, wherein the load status of the selected laboratory server is determined by querying, at the time of selection, a database containing load status information for the selected laboratory server.

Aoki teaches a printing system, wherein the load status of the selected laboratory server is determined by querying, at the time of selection, a database containing load status information for the selected laboratory server (inquiry message) (col. 12, lines 18-37).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Stewart with the teaching of Aoki to transmit a print job to a printer depending on its workload.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Satwant K. Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Satwant K. Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

sks

DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600